



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/601,327	08/08/2000	Agnes Bidard	194339US	2254

22850 7590 08/07/2002

OBLON SPIVAK MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT PC
FOURTH FLOOR
1755 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER

BUDD, MARK OSBORNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2834

DATE MAILED: 08/07/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

601 327

Applicant(s)

Bidard

Examiner

M. Budd

Group Art Unit

2834

---The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address---

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6-28-02
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2834

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Onishi(142), Tsuji or Onishi(368) in view of Takoshima.

Each of Onishi(142) (figs. 16 and 18), Tsuji (figs. 1-9) and Onishi(368) figs. 1-5) teach a piezoelectric SAW coupled to a printed circuit board thru a "first" layer and conductive vias piercing the first layer and conductive vias piercing the first layer and the printed circuit board. In Onishi (142) note the first layer would be the adhesive #7 that surrounds conductor #6 which is part of conductive via #124. In Onishi (368), again note first layer #7 which surrounds the conductive elements that are part of the vias that pierce the printed circuit board. In Tsuji, first layer #13 surrounds the conductor elements that electrically are part of the conductive vias that penetrate the printed circuit board. While it is true the conductors of Onishi and Tsuji are not constructed of a single element, it is noted that making parts integral or separable has long been held to be within the skill expected of the routineer. Onishi and Tsuji do not show the printed circuit board having the same surface dimensions as the SAW device. However, Takoshima teaches making the printed board with the same dimensions as the SAW to save space and eliminate the need for a further housing cover: using the flip-side of the SAW as an exterior

Application/Control Number: 09/601,327

Page 3

Art Unit: 2834

cover. Thus for at least these reasons it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Onishi or Tsuji with the PCB having dimensions as these of the SAW.

Budd/ek

08/06/02

[Handwritten signature]
BUDBUDD
USPTO EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2834